DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 874 EA 027 063

AUTHOR Kushner, Susan N.; And Others
TITLE A Portrait of School Improvement Efforts across Florida High Schools: A Content Analysis of 1993-94 School Improvement Plans.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Educational Assessment; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Objectives; High Schools; *Institutional Mission; Master Plans; *Mission Statements; Performance; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

In 1991, the Florida legislature adopted Blueprint 2000, a comprehensive system of school improvement. Guided by the National Education Goals and a commitment to flexibility at the local level, Blueprint 2000 renews the state's resolve to improve student performance by encouraging the involvement of all stakeholders in the schooling process. This paper presents findings of a study that examined the initial 1993-94 school-improvement plans submitted by Florida high schools in response to the mandates of Blueprint 2000. Methodology included a content analysis of the plans of 137 out of 274 Florida high schools. Not surprisingly, Florida high schools identified student achievement and the learning environment as a priority goal. School safety and adult literacy were not high-priority goals. Although the schools conducted needs assessments, the process and range of assessments were varied. School-improvement efforts were focused on raising test scores and improving attendance rates, which indicates that schools may be pressed to use hard data to demonstrate evidence of improvement. Finally, schools elected not to focus on identifying long-term goals. Eleven tables are included. (Contains 29 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Kushner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 387 874

A Portrait of School Improvement Efforts Across Florida High Schools: A Content Analysis of 1993-94 School Improvement Plans

Susan N. Kushner
University of Akron

Lou M. Carey
Jeffrey D. Kromrey
University of South Florida

In 1991, The Florida legislature adopted Blueprint 2000, a comprehensive and dramatic system of school improvement. Guided by the national education goals and an "unprecedented commitment to flexibility at the local level" (Caster, cited in Hansen & Welch, 1992), Blueprint 2000 renews the state's resolve to improve student performance by encouraging the involvement and input of all stakeholders in the schooling process. Many of the changes outlined in Blueprint 2000 reflect similar national and international reform efforts that emphasize site-based management of schools. The essence of Blueprint 2000 is the identification of seven state education goals and accompanying performance standards, the establishment of school advisory councils, and the development and implementation of school improvement plans. As mandated, Florida school districts must maintain a school advisory council for each school in the district. Composed of teachers, students, parents, and other community members, the council's primary responsibility is to assist in the preparation and evaluation of the annual school improvement plan. The plan guides an individual school's action toward school improvement and it includes the priority subgoals and programs a school proposes for meeting the state education goals. The plan is developed from a comprehensive needs-assessment based on the most currently available data and it is expected to include the following elements: goals, needs assessment, school progress, indicators of student progress, strategies and activities for improvement, and evaluation procedures. Florida schools implemented their initial improvement plans during the 1993-94 school year (Florida Commission, 1992; State of Florida, 1991).

The purpose of this study is to examine the initial 1993-94 school improvement plans that Florida high schools submitted in response to the mandates of Blueprint 2000. An analysis of the plans should provide useful information about the initial status of improvement efforts across Florida high schools. Since the plans are required by law to contain specific elements, the information in individual plans can be synthesized across plans, thus making it possible to draw conclusions about school improvement efforts across the state.

The analysis of written documents, such as school improvement plans, has been an under-used technique in educational evaluation (Garman, 1982; Guba & Lincoln, 1982); yet, such documents often provide an important and useful source of information about education endeavors. Documents present a natural, contextual source of information and document analysis helps to ground research by ensuring that the research is not removed from its social, historical, and political frame of reference. Documents can provide a more objective and valid means for understanding some aspect of behavior because the process itself is nonreactive (Caulley, 1983; Guba & Lincoln, 1982; Weber, 1990). Guba and Lincoln (1982) concluded that failure to use documents as a data source partly explains why educational inquiry is often not grounded. The value of using school improvement plans as a source of information is compromised, however, without a systematic method for extracting useful data from the plans.

Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 18-22, 1995

EA027063

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Content Analysis of Education Documents

Content analysis provides precise and objective means to describe the content of school improvement plans and other types of written documents. The methodological issues that are characteristic of content analysis are similar to those that typify other research methods. Content analysts "share the general concern within the social sciences for problems of inference, of which sampling, reliability, and validity are an integral part" Holsti, 1969, p. 14). Like other research endeavors, the initial step in content analysis entails the theoretically-based formulation of the research questions. Subsequent procedures include the following steps: developing a sampling plan, identifying the recording unit, constructing coding categories, managing the recording process, assessing reliability and validity, and analyzing the data (Berelson, 1952; Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967; Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980; Manning & Cullum-Swan, 1994). A rigorously conducted analysis, however, may have limited meaning unless the research questions have theoretical relevance. Systems analysis, a contemporary application of General Systems Theory, provides a relevant theoretical framework for interpreting the content of Florida's school improvement plans.

Using Systems Analysis to Examine School Improvement Plans

Systems analysis is a set of techniques or tools that is often used during the planning and decision-making stages of an organization (Weiner, 1978). One function of systems analysis is to create a model that identifies the parts and processes of an organization, analyzes the relationships among the parts and processes, and determines how these relationships affect the performance of the overall system. During the past several decades, various models of educational systems have been proposed for describing educational purposes and organizations (Baruch, 1983; Buckley, 1968; Burton & Merrill, 1991: Kaufman, 1988; Neuroth, Plastrik, & Cleveland, 1992; Patterson, Purkey & Jackson, 1986). Kaufman's Organizational Elements Model (1988; 1992; Kaufman & Herman, 1991; Kaufman & Zahn, 1993) is a recent educational systems model that is especially fitting for the study. The Organizational Elements Model (CEM) is a comprehensive strategy for identifying the components of an educational system. The model is a results-oriented approach that links resources and processes with three kinds of educational results. The five organizational elements of the OEM model are inputs, processes, products, outputs, and outcomes and they are defined as follows:

Inputs are all of a school's resources (e.g., financial, personnel, facilities, equipment, and community) for carrying out its objectives and goals as well as the knowledge, values, policies, laws, and political realities that influence its mission and activity.

Processes are the methods, procedures, and activities (e.g., planning, teaching, managing, evaluating) that a school employs to deliver results.

Products are micro-level results that are internal to a school (e.g., completed courses, acquired skills, learner accomplishments). Products are the en-route, building blocks of an education system and can be thought of as what a school accomplishes rather than what it delivers to society.

Outputs are macro-level results that reflect the integration or the sum of educational products. Outputs are results that are delivered from the school to the community (e.g., graduates, completers, dropouts, etc., who may or may not have the skills, abilities, and attitudes to participate in society.)

Outcomes are the consequences of educational outputs. They are mega-level results that have a long-term impact on society (e.g., self-sufficient graduates who are contributing members of society, parents and community members who are satisfied with the quality of education.)

A unique characteristic of the OEM model is that it distinguishes between educational goals that are internal to the system (products), and goals that are likely to have more long-range societal effects (outcomes).

Other models often fail to acknowledge that educational systems are means to *societal* ends. In comparison, the OEM model recognizes that the aim of educational planning should be both to produce successful school learners and to prepare students to be contributing members of society. According to Kaufman, "learning does not stop at the school house door, and educational experiences should encourage kids to be inquiring throughout life" (1988, p. 7). While the OEM model was designed as an educational planning and management tool for moving from current status to desired results, the model can also be used as a template for examining school improvement plans. The distinction between micro-, macro-, and mega-level educational results makes the OEM model especially appropriate for examining school plans since a basic tenet of Blueprint 2000 is to prepare Florida students to be successful and contributing citizens in a "global economy and a changing social structure" (Florida Commission, 1992, p. i). In this study, the OEM model was used to examine the anticipated educational results that are described in school improvement plans. Specifically, the products, outputs, and outcomes were used as coding categories in a content analysis of the plans.

Research Questions

The following three research questions are the focus of this study:

1. What emphasis is placed on each of the seven state-level goals of Blueprint 2000 across school improvement plans? (See Table 1 for a description of the goals).

2. Within Goal 3 "Student Performance", what emphasis is placed on the 10 student performance standards across school improvement plans? (The performance standards are measurable objectives that specify an outcome at a school-level which fulfills or partially fulfills its corresponding goal. See Table 2 for a description of the Goal 3 standards).

3. Which of the three types of OEM results (products, outputs, or outcomes) are identified most frequently across Goal 3 "Student Performance"?

Goal 3 "Student Performance" is of particular interest because historically, Americans have used student achievement to gauge the success or failure of their schools. In fact, a key interest among education analysts is the impact that site-based management will have on student performance (Carlos & Amsler, 1993). It is also of interest to consider whether the anticipated results of Florida's school improvement efforts are short-term results or the life-long learning outcomes that are a basic principle of Blueprint 2000.

Methods

Sample. A random stratified sample of 137 high schools was selected from a population of 274 Florida high schools. The sample size was determined by constructing a 90% confidence interval around the estimate of π, the population parameter of interest, and using the finite population correction to calculate the standard error (Freund, 1979; Levy & Lemeshow, 1991). A sample size of 137 yields a 90% confidence interval that is no larger than plus or minus five percent. The sample was proportionally stratified by geographic region to ensure accurate representation.

General Procedures. To facilitate the organization of the 137 documents, the plans were classified by region, and the name of each region was abbreviated with a single letter of the alphabet. The school improvement plans within each region and the specific objectives within each plan were numerically coded. A two-part numbering system was used. For instance, the code A12.4 indicates the fourth objective within the twelfth school improvement plan in Region A. A master list of school improvement objectives was created. To preserve anonymity, specific references to a school or district were replaced with more generic wording. For example, an objective that began "To improve Elm Street High School students' performance on district academic indices" was reworded to read "To improve our students' performance on district academic indices". The specific procedures for addressing the three research questions followed traditional content analysis methods.

Question #1 Procedures. To determine the emphasis placed on each Blueprint 2000 goal, the improvement objectives within each of the plans were linked to a corresponding goal. In 120 of the plans, the improvement objectives were already classified by goal and a sample of plans was examined to verify the validity of these classifications. In this instance, the coding procedure was a simple tallying process. The objectives within the remaining 17 plans were not explicitly identified by goal. Form 1 was used to classify these objectives. Copies of Form 1 and subsequent coding forms are included in the Appendix.

Two independent coders were selected and trained to classify the objectives. The coders used Form 1 to classify a set of school improvement objectives that were already explicitly linked to a goal. The linked objectives served as a standard against which to assess the accuracy of the coders. Cohen's (1960) kappa was calculated to assess each coder's level of agreement against a standard, intra-rater agreement, and inter-rater agreement. Typically, values of kappa that range from .40 to .60 are considered fair, values from .60 to .75 are considered good, and values greater than .75 are considered very good. Against a standard, k=.67 for Coder 1 and k=.67 for Coder 2. Inter-rater agreement was .64 Approximately two weeks after the first set of trial objectives were classified, the coders reclassified the objectives and both intra- and inter-rater agreement were assessed. Intra-rater agreement was .70 for Coder 1 and .70 for Coder 2. Inter-rater agreement was .82. Since the value of kappa equaled .60 or greater in the preliminary analyses and the coders reported no difficulties or problems encountered during the trial coding, no modifications were made to the form or the procedures. The coders proceeded to code the actual set of 144 objectives. Kappa for this set of objectives was .86, indicating a very good level of agreement. Coding discrepancies were examined and in most instances agreement was reached by inspecting the individual school plan. Examining the plans usually provided sufficient contextual information to code the objective in a single category. If consensus could not be reached, the objective was classified across more than one goal. Classifying an objectives across more than one goal was not problematic. In nearly all instances, objective could be classified across goals without effecting the number of goals addressed within a plan.

Question #2 Procedures. The subset of Goal 3 objectives that were of interest in the remainder of the study were generated as an outcome of the first research question. A total of 528 Goal 3 improvement objectives were identified. Similar to the procedures described for the first research question, two independent coders used Form 2 to code a trial set of objectives by performance standard, and kappa was calculated. The results of the trial coding indicated possible inadequacies with the coding form. Kappa for Inter-rater agreement was .47. The coders reported some difficulty in using the 10 performance standards as coding categories. They concluded that a large number of objectives fell outside of the 10 standards. Specifically, they indicated that many objectives expressly referred to raising standardized test scores and other similar performance criteria. In addition, a large number of objectives were stated in very general terms and could not be classified as addressing a specific standard. Based on the low values of kappa and the coders recommendations, Form 2 was modified by adding two additional categories, "Performance Criteria" and "General". Using the modified form, another set of trial objectives was coded. Inter-rater agreement was .63, and intra-rater agreement was .79 and .65 for Coders 1 and 2. Inter-rater agreement was assessed two weeks later and k=.82. Subsequently, the coders classified the 528 Goal 3 objectives. Kappa for this set of objectives was .61, indicating a good level of agreement. Coding discrepancies were examined and if consensus could not be reached, the objectives were classified across more than one standard. Classifying an objective across more than one standard was not problematic. In nearly all cases, an objective could be classified across standards without effecting the number of standards addressed within the plan.

Question #3 Procedures. Two independent coders used Form 3 to classify each of the Goal 3 improvement objectives as product, output, or outcome. A set of Goal 3 objectives were used for trial coding and kappa was calculated. Inter-rater agreement was .44 and intra-rater agreement was .71 and .52. Approximately two weeks later, inter-rater agreement was reassessed and k = .63. The coders reported no difficulties or problems using Form 3. Although several of the initial values of kappa appeared low, it was

decided to proceed with the coding of the actual objectives. In actuality, Form 3 was the first of the coding forms to be evaluated. It seemed logical to conclude that, with experience, the coders may have become more comfortable with the wording of the objectives and the nature of the coding process itself. This premise appeared to be substantiated with an acceptable level of agreement when inter-rater agreement was reassessed. The coders classified the 528 Goal 3 objectives and kappa for this set of objectives was .62, indicating a good level of agreement. Coding discrepancies were examined and if a consensus could not be reached, the objective was classified across more than one category. Again, classifying an objective across more than one category was not problematic.

Data Analysis. The emphasis placed on the categories of interest (i.e., goal, performance standard, educational result) was determined by calculating the proportion of plans that addressed each category and comparing the differences between the proportions. A traditional approach to examining differences between proportions might have been to conduct an omnibus test to examine the differences between the proportion of schools that addressed a specific category. An omnibus test is an overall test that determines whether there are any statistical differences among three or more groups. An omnibus test is typically followed by post hoc comparisons to identify specific differences between the groups. This approach has come under recent criticism, however, because often times the omnibus test does not directly address the substantive issues. Rather, it is the more focused analyses that succeed the omnibus test that are of prime interest (Olejnik & Huberty, 1993; Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1989). Such is the case in this study. Therefore, an alternative approach to an omnibus test was conducted. First, the various proportions of interest for each research question were calculated. Then, for each question, McNemar's test of correlated proportions was used to make all possible pairwise comparisons (Fleiss, 1981; Glass & Hopkins, 1984). Finally, Holm's (1979) modification to the Bonferroni procedure was used to identify the statistically significant comparisons. The Holm technique is a powerful step-down procedure for controlling experimentwise Type I errors. Experimentwise Type I errors are problematic when multiple hypothesis tests are conducted within a single question.

A second way to determine the emphasis placed on each category was to consider the frequency with which an objective was classified for each category across the sample of 137 plans. Thus, the number of objectives identified for each category was tallied. Since the objectives within each plan are considered dependent observations, further inferential analyses of the objectives is not appropriate.

Results

Question 1. The number of school plans that addressed the seven state-level goals of Blueprint 2000 are listed in Table 3A. Not surprising, Goal 3 "Student Performance" emerged as a priority goal. Goal 4 "Learning Environment" was also considered important as slightly more than 80 percent of the plans addressed this goal. Approximately two-thirds to three-quarters of the plans addressed Goal 2 "Graduation Rate", Goal 5, "School Safety and Environment", and Goal 6 "Teachers and Staff". Goal 1 "Readiness to Start School" and Goal 7 "Adult Literacy" were addressed the least often with slightly less than half of the plans addressing these goals.

Twenty-one pairwise comparisons were made to determine statistically significant differences between the proportions of plans that addressed each goal. Seventeen of the comparisons were significant and they are listed in Table 3B. Several patterns can be discerned from Table 3B. Once again, Goal 3 and Goal 4 were identified as priority goals across the plans. The proportion of plans that addressed Goal 3 was significantly greater than the proportion of plans that addressed the other six goals. The proportion of plans that addressed Goal 4 was significantly greater than the proportion of plans that addressed Goals 1, 5, 6, and 7. Second, Goal 1 "Readiness to Start School" and Goal 7 "Adult Literacy" were considered the least important. The proportion of plans that addressed Goal 1 and Goal 7 was significantly less than all other goals. Finally, Goal 2 "Graduation Rate", Goal 5 "School Safety and Environment", and Goal 6 "Teachers and Staff" received moderate emphasis across plans. The proportions of plans that addressed these goals was significantly greater than Goals 1 and 7 and less than Goals 3 and 4. The number of objectives across the plans that corresponded to

each goal is presented in Table 3C. more objectives were classified as Goal 3 and Goal 4 objectives and less objectives were classified as Goal 1 and Goal 7 objectives.

Question 2. The number of school plans that addressed the 10 performance standards of Goal 3 "Student Performance" and the two additional coding categories are presented in Table 4A. Approximately half the plans addressed the two additional coding categories. "Performance Criteria" and "General". Slightly over one-third of the plans addressed Standard 5 "Display Responsibility". Standards 6, 7, 8, and 9 received the least emphasis with 10 percent or less of the plans addressing these standards.

Sixty-five pairwise comparisons were made to determine statistically significant differences between the proportions of plans that addressed the ten standards and two additional categories. Thirty-four of the comparisons were significant and they are listed in Table 4B. Several patterns can be discerned from Table 4B. First, the proportion of plans that addressed the "Performance Criteria" and "General" categories was significantly greater than the proportion of plans that addressed the 10 Goal 3 standards. Second, the proportion of plans that addressed Standard 5 "Display Responsibility" was significantly greater than the proportion of plans that addressed the other nine performance standards. Finally, the proportion of plans that addressed Standard 6 "Allocate Resources" was significantly less than the proportion of plans that addressed the majority of the other standards. Table 4C lists the number of objectives classified for each standard.

Question 3. The number of school plans that addressed the products, outputs, and outcomes of the OEM model are presented in Table 5A. Nearly all of the school plans addressed educational results that are more internal to schools (products) and far fewer of the plans addressed more long term results (outputs and outcomes). Three pairwise comparisons were made to determine statistically significant differences between the proportions of plans that addressed the three types of educational results. All of the comparisons were significant and they are listed in Table 5B. A pattern can be discerned from Table 5B. First, the proportion of plans that addressed short-term results was significantly greater than the proportion of plans that addressed more long term results. Second, the proportion of plans that addressed outcomes is greater than the proportion of plans that addressed outputs. Given the limited number of plans and objectives that were classified as outputs and outcomes, there may be less substantive difference between these categories. The following are examples of improvement objectives classified as products, outputs, and outcomes:

"Decrease number of students referred to the office for disciplinary reasons 15% each year." (Product)

"Eighty percent of students enrolled in lower level math course will demonstrate mastery of numeric skills as demonstrated by successful completion in pre-algebra." (Product)

"The district curriculum will improve vocational preparation of students." (Output).

"Increase student performance, graduation rate and readiness for postsecondary study and employment." (Output)

"Our students will become successful participants in their future and the future of society, wherever they go in the United States. " (Outcome)

"To devise curricula that empowers all students to become life-long learners, critical thinkers, and productive citizens in a diverse society." (Outcome)

Thematic Analysis. The objective and systematic procedures of content analysis provide effective methods for examining school improvement plans. In addition, the more qualitative approach of thematic analysis contributes to the understanding of the substantive nature of Florida high schools' improvement efforts. A thorough thematic analysis is beyond the scope of this study. Several initial observations, however, are included.

First, an inspection of the objectives across and within standards revealed three underlying themes: a student focus, a curricular focus, or an organizational focus. Objectives that have a student focus addressed skills and knowledge and actions that students are expected to demonstrate. For example:

"Our students will improve their skills in areas of comprehension, evaluation, and application of traditional written resources as well as computer and video sources." (Standard #1)

"Students will have more participation in the disciplinary process through a student court." (Standard #5)

"Each students will develop short and long term personal goals to be re-evaluated on a scheduled basis with parent involvement". (Standard #8)

"To improve student test scores (district, state, national) as well as improve student grade point averages." (Performance)

Objectives that have a curricular focus considered the content or process of instruction. For example:

"Implement and evaluate cultural awareness programs." (Standard #10)

"Incorporate more technology into our delivery of instruction." (Standard #7)

"Place increased emphasis on teaching study skills, thinking skills and research/library skills across the curriculum." (Standard #4)

Objectives with an organizational focus addressed such issues as scheduling, administrative policies and procedures, school climate, and communication patterns. For example:

"Educate the community about positive programs that are in existence at our school." (General)

"Our school will continue to promote positive multicultural relationships." (Standard #10)

"Insure optimal test administration procedures and environment." (Performance)

"Investigate the possibility of adopting flexible time into the school's schedule to give parents, mentors, etc. time to meet with teachers, counselors, and administrators." (General)

Second, the objectives within the "General" category could be readily classified as having a student, curricular, or organizational focus. The majority of the objectives were statements that addressed the content and process of instruction, or parental and community involvement. For example:

"To increase the number of teachers utilizing student-centered cooperative learning." (Curricular Focus)

"The district curriculum will improve the vocational preparation of students." (Curricular Focus)

"To improve communications between school and home." (Organizational Focus)

"Solicit the community to participate in increased partnerships with our school and secures at least 15 new partners." (Organizational Focus)

A third pattern that was easily discerned occurred within Standard 5 "Student Responsibility". The majority of the 'student focus' objectives within this standard dealt with increasing student attendance rates. For example:

> "By the end of the 1993-94 school year, student attendance will increase by 1% over the 1992-93 attendance rate as determined by the Florida School Report."
>
> "The rate of attendance of migrant students will increase at least 10%."

Finally, within the "Performance Criteria" category, most objectives were aimed at raising test scores and GPA. Two state-wide exams, the Grade Ten Assessment Test and the High School Competency Test, were frequently mentioned. For example:

> "One hundred percent of the high school seniors will pass the High School Competency Test."
>
> "Increase student scores on the Grade Ten Assessment Test by 5%."
>
> "Increase the school-wide GPA."
>
> "Increase the number of 10th grade students achieving above 2.0 by 5%."

Discussion

When content analysis is limited to the manifest content of documents the analysis is somewhat straightforward. Interpreting the latent content of documents, such as school improvement plans, is more challenging. Not surprising, Florida high schools identified student achievement as a priority goal. Goal 7 "Adult Literacy" was not a priority goal. In fact, Goal 7 was considered one of the least important of the seven state-level goals. This result is rather surprising because the high school domain seems the most logical to address this goal. Goal 5 "School Safety and Environment" appeared to be a moderate priority and this result is somewhat unexpected. The authors of the 1994 Gallup Poll concluded that "the current uproar about violence in the schools" may be, to some extent, "a media phenomenon" (Elam, Lowell, & Gallup, 1994, p. 42). They cite a 1993 study conducted for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company that showed that most teachers and students felt safe in school. Perhaps this is the case in Florida high schools, if one assumes that the information within the school plans is a valid indication of improvement efforts across the state.

By law, school advisory councils were required to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment based on the most currently available data. Furthermore, the councils were obliged to address the topic of needs assessment within the plans themselves. Indeed, the majority of councils did address needs assessment and other procedures and strategies that they followed in developing their plan, but with varying amounts of detail. In many instances, the authors of the plans stated that more detailed information was available. Admittedly, it is likely that some school plans may be based on an incomplete needs assessment or may reflect the voice of a few vocal committee members. The "intent" of site-based management and group-decision making models and their actual "implementation" may, in some cases, be quite disparate. However, it is just as likely that school councils undertook the task at hand with competence and diligence. Nevertheless, there is substantial assurance that the school improvement objectives identified in the plans are a valid indication of current efforts across Florida high schools. At the conclusion of the year, each council must document progress toward the objectives identified in the plans. The Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability has been charged with developing "guidelines for action to be taken for any school that does not improve after three years of assistance and intervention" (Florida Commission, p. 6)

Within Goal 3 "Student Performance" some distinct patterns are quite evident. Clearly, school improvement efforts are focused on raising test scores and improving attendance rates. This pattern of internal, micro-level results might be interpreted in two ways. One might argue that students who attend school regularly and perform well on standardized measures are more likely to have mastered the skills and knowledge that will prepare them for the workforce and postsecondary education. Or, one might contend that the Florida high schools are pressed to use hard data, such as attendance level and test scores, to demonstrate "evidence" of school improvement. The later conclusion is supported by the fact that Florida schools are issued a yearly "report card" by the state Department of Education. Data such as test scores and attendance rates are distributed to parents and typically published in the local newspaper. Identifying long-term goals that were easily measured and documented may have been a task that school councils elected not to address at this time. Several of the standards received such trivial consideration across the plans that one might question why the Blueprint 2000 authors identified them as priority student performance standards.

Of interest in subsequent studies will be a more thorough thematic analysis a Goal 3 objectives as well as an examination of the resources and strategies that schools identified for achieving the objectives. Linking the elements of the OEM may reveal additional patterns that characterize school improvement efforts. An examination of Goal 4 is also of interest since this goal emerged as a second priority goal. David (1989) cautioned that fully implemented school-based management, such as Florida's Blueprint 2000, requires 5 to 10 years to achieve and that it is imprudent to make conclusive judgements in the early stages of implementation. Thus, the analysis of Florida high schools' initial school improvement plans provides baseline, rather than definitive, information about improvement efforts. Subsequent studies may reveal more conclusive trends in school improvement efforts.

References

Baruch, E. B. (1983). Schools as social systems. Herzlia, Israel: Unipress Academic Publications.

Berelson, B. (1952). Content analysis in communication research. New York: Hafner.

Buckley, W. (Ed.). (1968). Modern systems research for the behavioral scientist. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Budd, R. W., Thorp, R. K. & Donohew, L. (1967). Content analysis of communications. New York: Macmillian.

Burton, J. K., & Merrill, P. F. (1991). Needs assessment:Goals, needs, and priorities. In L. J. Briggs, K. L. Gustafson, & M. H. Tillman (Eds.), Instructional design principles and applications. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Carlos, L. & Amsler, M. (1993). Site-based management: An experiment in governance (Policy Briefs No. 20). San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 522)

Caulley, D. N. (1983). Document analysis in program evaluation. Evaluation and Program Planning, 6, 19-29).

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20(1), 37-46.

David, J. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 753-761.

Elam, S. M., Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (1994). The 26th annual Phi Delta Kappa Gallup Poll. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(1), 41-56.

Florida Commission on Education and Accountability (1992). Blueprint 2000: A system of school improvement and accountability. Tallahassee, FL: State of Florida, Department of State.

Garman, K. (1982). Eastside, westside...An exercise in applying document analysis techniques in educational evaluation. (Northwest Regional Education Lab Report Series, No. 78). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 872)

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hansen, K. & Welch, M. J. (Eds.). (1992). Every Floridian's guide to school improvement and educational accountability. Tallahassee, FL: State of Florida Department of Education.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Huberman, A. M. & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods (pp. 428-444). In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kaufman, R. (1988). Planning educational systems. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc.

Kaufman, R. (1992). Mapping educational success. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Kaufman, R. & Herman, J. (1991). Strategic planning in education. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc.

Kaufman, R. & Zahn, D. (1993). Quality management plus. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Levy, P. S., & Lemeshow, S. (1991). Sampling of populations: Methods and Applications. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Manning, P. K., & Cullum-Swan, B. (1994). Narrative, content, and semiotic analysis (pp. 463-477). In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Neuroth, J., Plastrik, P., & Cleveland, J. (1992). TQM handbook: Applying the Baldridge criteria to schools. Lansing, MI: On Purpose Associates.

Peterson, D. (1991). School-based management and student performance. (ERIC Digest, No. 62). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 845).

State of Florida (1991). Official Florida statutes 1991. Tallahassee, FL: Author.

Weber, R. P. (1990). Basic content analysis, second edition. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Weiner, M. E. (1978). Application of organization and systems theory to human services reform. (DHEW Publication No. OS-76-130). Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Table 1. Blueprint 2000 School Improvement Goals

Goal 1: Readiness to Start School

Communities and schools collaborate to prepare children and families for children's success in school.

Goal 2: Graduation Rate and Readiness for Postsecondary Education and Employment

Students graduate and are prepared to enter the workforce and postsecondary education.

Goal 3: Student Performance

Students successfully compete at the highest levels nationally and internationally and are prepared to make well-reasoned, thoughtful, and healthy lifelong decisions.

Goal 4: Learning Environment

School boards provide a learning environment conducive to teaching and learning that includes sequential instruction in mathematics, science, reading, writing, and the social sciences and appropriate educational materials, equipment, and pupil-teacher ratio.

Goal 5: School Safety and Environment

Communities provide an environment that is drug-free and protects students' health, safety, and civil rights.

Goal 6: Teachers and Staff

The schools, districts, and state ensure professional teachers and staff.

Goal 7: Adult Literacy

Adult Floridians are literate and have the knowledge and skills needed to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Table 2. Performance Standards for Goal 3

Standard #1
Florida students locate, comprehend, interpret, evaluate, maintain, and apply information, concepts, and ideas found in literature, the arts, symbols, recordings, video and other graphic displays, and computer files, in order to perform tasks and/or for enjoyment.

Standard #2
Florida students communicate in English and other languages using information, concepts, prose,symbols, reports, audio and video recordings, speeches, graphic displays, and computer-based programs.

Standard #3
Florida students use numeric operations and concepts to describe, analyze, disaggregate, communicate, and synthesize numeric data, and to identify and solve problems.

Standard #4
Florida students use creative thinking skills to generate new ideas, make the best decision, recognize and solve problems through reasoning, interpret symbolic data, and develop efficient techniques for lifelong learning.

Standard #5
Florida students display responsibility, self-esteem, sociability, self management, integrity, and honesty.

Standard #6
Florida students will appropriately allocate time, money, materials, and other resources.

Standard #7
Florida students integrate their knowledge and understanding of how social, organizational, informational, and technological systems work with their abilities to analyze trends, design and improve systems, and use and maintain appropriate technology.

Standard #8
Florida students work cooperatively to successfully complete a project or activity.

Standard #9
Florida students establish credibility with their colleagues through competence and integrity, and help their peers achieve their goals by communicating their feelings and ideas to justify or successfully negotiate a position which advances goal attainment.

Standard #10
Florida students appreciate their own culture and the cultures of others, understand the concerns and perspectives of members of other ethnic and gender groups, reject the stereotyping of themselves and others, and seek out and utilize the views of persons from divers ethnic, social, and educational backgrounds while completing individual and group projects.

Table 3A. The Number of Plans that Address Each Blueprint 2000 Goal

Goal	Frequency	Percent
#1 Readiness to Start School	61	45%
#2 Graduate Rate and Readiness for Postsecondary Education and Employment	106	77%
#3 Student Performance	124	91%
#4 Learning Environment	114	83%
#5 School Safety and Environment	89	65%
#6 Teachers and Staff	94	67%
#7 Adult Literacy	65	47%

Table 3B. Statistically Significant Pairwise Comparisons between the Proportions of Schools addressing the 7 Blueprint 2000 Goals

Comparison	Chi-Square	Obtained p
Goal 2 x Goal 5	8.257	.004
Goal 2 x Goal 3	9.530	.002
Goal 4 x Goal 6	13.334	.000
Goal 5 x Goal 7	18.000	.000
Goal 2 x Goal 7	35.714	.000
Goal 1 x Goal 2	38.208	.000
Goal 1 x Goal 3	61.061	.000
Goal 1 x Goal 4	47.610	.000
Goal 1 x Goal 5	17.043	.000
Goal 1 x Goal 6	24.200	.000
Goal 3 x Goal 4	35.766	.000
Goal 3 x Goal 5	31.410	.000
Goal 3 x Goal 6	25.000	.000
Goal 3 x Goal 7	57.066	.000
Goal 4 x Goal 5	21.552	.000
Goal 4 x Goal 7	49.000	.000
Goal 6 x Goal 7	24.029	.000

Table 3C. Number of School Improvement Objectives that Address each Blueprint 2000 Goal*

Goal	Frequency
#1 Readiness to Start School	125
#2 Graduate Rate and Readiness for Postsecondary Education and Employment	277
#3 Student Performance	528
#4 Learning Environment	384
#5 School Safety and Environment	195
#6 Teachers and Staff	203
#7 Adult Literacy	112

*Objectives may have been classified across one or more goals

Table 4A. Number of Plans that Address the 10 Goal 3 Student Performance Standards and 2 Additional Categories

Standard		Frequency	Percent
#1	Locate and comprehend information	22	16%
#2	Communicate in English and other languages	28	20%
#3	Use numeric operations to analyze numeric data and solve problems	22	16%
#4	Use creative thinking skills	24	18%
#5	Display responsibility	52	38%
#6	Allocate time, money, materials, and other resources	4	3%
#7	Integrate knowledge about social, organizational, informational, and technological systems	14	10%
#8	Work cooperatively to complete a project or activity	11	8%
#9	Establish credibility with their colleagues	9	7%
#10	Appreciate culture and the cultures of others	22	16%
Additional Categories			
	Performance Criteria	74	54%
	General	71	52%

Table 4B. Statistically Significant Pairwise Comparisons between the 10 Standards and 2 Addtional Categories

Comparison	Chi-Square	Obtained p
Standard 2 x Standard 5	10.667	.001
Standard 2 x Standard 8	12.565	.000
Standard 2 x Standard 9	14.440	.000
Standard 2 x Standard 6	22.154	.000
Standard 2 x Performance	30.229	.000
Standard 2 x General	26.797	.000
Standard 1 x Standard 5	16.667	.000
Standard 1 x Standard 6	13.500	.000
Standard 1 x Performance	38.629	.000
Standard 1 x General	36.938	.000
Standard 3 x Standard 6	18.000	.000
Standard 3 x Standard 5	18.750	.000
Standard 3 x Performance	39.765	.000
Standard 3 x General	34.797	.000
Standard 4 x Standard 5	13.067	.000
Standard 4 x Standard 6	18.189	.000
Standard 4 x Performance	29.762	.000
Standard 4 x General	32.014	.000
Standard 5 x Standard 6	46.08	.000
Standard 5 x Standard 7	31.391	.000
Standard 5 x Standard 8	39.093	.000
Standard 5 x Standard 9	37.735	.000
Standard 5 x Standard 10	22.500	.000
Standard 6 x Standard 10	16.200	.000
Standard 6 x Performance	68.056	.000
Standard 6 x General	67.000	.000
Standard 7 x Performance	48.649	.000
Standard 7 x General	49.985	.000
Standard 8 x Performance	52.920	.000
Standard 8 x General	54.545	.000
Standard 9 x Performance	56.334	.000
Standard 9 x General	58.242	.000
Standard 10 x Performance	34.667	.000
Standard 10 x General	35.836	.000

Table 4C. Number of School Improvement Ojectives that Address the 10 Goal 3 Performance Standards and 2 Additional Categories *

Standard		Frequency
#1	Locate and comprehend information	28
#2	Communicate in English and other languages	39
#3	Use numeric operations to analyze numeric data and solve problems	30
#4	Use creative thinking skills	26
#5	Display responsibility	83
#6	Allocate time, money, materials, and other resources	4
#7	Integrate knowledge about social, organizational, informational, and technological systems	32
#8	Work cooperatively to complete a project or activity	13
#9	Establish credibility with their colleagues	9
#10	Appreciate culture and the cultures of others	27
Additional Categories		
	Performance Criteria	162
	General	151

* Objectives may be classified across categories

Table 5A. Number of Plans that Address Each Educational Result

Education Result	Frequency	Percent
Product	124	90.5%
Output	16	11.7%
Outcome	29	21.2%

Table 5B. All Pairwise Comparisons between the Proportions of Schools Addressing Each Types of Educational Result

Comparison	Chi-Square	Obtained p
Output x Outcome	4.568	.033
Product x Outcome	87.621	.000
Product x Output	108.000	.000

Table 5C. Number of Goal 3 School Improvement Objectives Classified as Products, Outputs, and Outcomes

Education Result	Frequency	Percent
Product	456	86.4%
Output	23	4.4%
Outcome	49	9.2%
Total	528	100%